DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 029 551 HE 000 298

By-Sampson, Edward E.

A Modern Sisyphus Goes to College.

American Psychological Association, Washington, D.C.
Pub Date Sep 68
Note-13p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association, San Francisco, California, August 30-September 3, 1968
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$0.75
Descriptors-•Activism, •Higher Education, •Institutional Role, Participation, •Social Change, Social Responsibility
Identifiers-•Community-in-Society

Both Clark Kerr and Zbigniew Brzezinski argue that American society is becoming technologically complex or "technetronic" and that the new multiversity is the appropriate type of higher education institution to serve that society. The historically relevant man must adjust himself to these circumstances: the historically irrelevant one can continue his "Sisyphian" life. A different argument using historical inevitability begins with the needs of the individual. Here, the new era and its institutions will have to be modified to serve the individual. Thus, the humanistic protest movements, including the Third World's revolution for social justice and the Fourth World's revolution for quality, are historically relevant and represent sensitivity to the future. This dialectic argues for a movement away from Society, a period of renewed emphasis on the Community, and, finally, a new synthesis: "community-in-society." Two of the major issues reflecting this dialectic are the concept of individual participation in decision making and the revolt against the excessive rationalization of all life. Both trends are now at work in the university which has been the bastion of superrationalization. The present influential Establishment against change could well be called "the military-industrial-educational complex." A university that would lead us into the new community-in-society would have to make rather radical changes in its own complexion. (JS)

ED029551

A Modern Sisyphus Goes to College[1]

Edward E. Sampson
University of California, Berkeley

Sad but appropriate. . . . Those two great monolithic business corporations which present education (especially undergraduate) as their major loss-leader item, one public, the other private, one on the West Coast, the other, the East, each of which has experienced massive doses of revolutionary student protest, have produced two authors who had much the same perspective on modern times and the role to be played by the university.

Writing in 1963 at that time from the vantaged perspective of the Presidency of the half-billion dollar enterprise known as the University of California, Clark Kerr gave us an excellent description of the complex modern phenomenon which he called the multiversity. More recently (May 1967), Kerr expanded on several of his earlier comments, taking to task those who urged a change away from what he felt to be the inevitable direction of development of higher education. These utopian theories, he argued, have little to do with the modern age in which we live, one in which the multiversity must necessarily service the needs of a technological society:

> The cry for community, the cry for integration of thought and action are cries that call backward to a smaller, simpler world. The revolutionary visions of today are of the old, not the new, of ancient Athens and medieval Paris and not of modern New York. . . . The longing for community, for this fantasy, this pie-in-the-sky, can actually impede efforts to make better that which must be. . . . The campus consistent with society has served as a good introduction to society--to bigness, to specialization, to diffusion of interests; to problems, to possibilities.

Meanwhile, back at Columbia, Zbigniew Brzezinski, a political science professor (former adviser to LBJ, now working with HHH), wrote a rather intriguing

---

[1]Presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association, San Francisco, September 1968.

HE 000 292

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

account of revolution and counterrevolution, but as he put it, "not necessarily about Columbia!"

Brzezinski maintains that America today is in its postindustrial era. In his terms, it is becoming a technetronic society. With this as our future, he argues, any valid and significant revolutionary process-rather than a counterrevolution-must be historically relevant: i.e., it must be oriented towards this technetronic future. Counterrevolutionary movements respond to the past rather than to the future. Student activism, he maintains, is past oriented and therefore counterrevolutionary. In the noise and sometimes violence of our student protestors and their faculty supporters, according to Brzezinski's analysis, we hear "the death rattle of the historical irrelevants:" "that is, students and faculty who, for one reason or another, have been unable to adjust to the forms of life essential to the university in the technetronic age."

Fascinating to ponder. Both Kerr and Brzezinski paint a picture of the future of society and of the inevitable role that the university will play in this future. Furthermore, those who do not accept the inevitability of this future are to be cast aside as being historically irrelevant dissidents. On closer examination, however, it is clear that these authors and their supporters base their argument on an assumption that is rather frightening to contemplate and extraordinarily incomplete if not essentially erroneous and itself historically misguided.

The assumption: The historical inevitability is that malleable man will be changed in order to meet the needs of modern society.

The argument: Society is becoming technologically complex or technetronic. Social institutions are changing to meet this new form of society. The multiversity is here to serve that new society. And man had better accustom himself to these facts. At least, the man who would be historically relevant

should adjust himself. Those of us who do not mind being historically irrelevant can continue with our Sisyphian lives.

A different assumptive starting point, however, begins with the individual. The historical inevitability in this dialectic is that the needs of man will once again come to occupy history's center stage. Each of the preceding conceptions, it is to be noted, lacks a reasonable psychological theory of man: i.e., a theory of personality and motivation. If we "read" into their works any conception at all, it is that basically man must be passive, acquiescent, malleable or exist as permanently alienated. At least historically relevant man must be. But if we begin with the individual, with his needs; if we envision him as an active agent, in terms of a self-actualizing theory, if we grant him emotions and passions as well as intellect and reason, our framework changes. Here we argue that the new era and its institutions--the malleables in this dialectic--will have to be modified in order to serve the needs of the individual and not simply to serve the needs of that lifeless abstraction, technetronic society. If we now apply Brzezinski's method for analyzing the validity and significance of the revolutionary process, we would maintain that the humanistic protest movements, still small in absolute number, nevertheless hold the revolutionary position of historical relevance: these movements which argue for a return to the importance of satisfying rather than frustrating individual needs and aspirations are where the future is at. The responses of the under-thirty's social movements, active protest and otherwise, in fact reflect a keenly instinctive grasp of man's essential human needs. They are manned by our most intelligent and most aware young citizens by those most in touch with today's realities. They represent a sensitivity to the future rather than, as Brzezinski would have us believe, the final gasping death rattle of the historical irrelevants.

Although space will not permit me to delve into the relevant historical matters that provide perspective on the contemporary situation, I should like to point out that the issues involved are by no means new. Several writers in the mid-19th and the early 20th century, notably Alexis de Tocqueville, Max Weber, and George Simmel, subjected the relationship between the individual and the society to their perceptive, humanely sensitive analyses. Each in his own way noted the two-sided sword that was man's future as his bondage to traditional society gave way to modernism with its own form of bondage. De Tocqueville's equalitarian democracy, Weber's rationalized bureaucracy, and Simmel's objectified metropolis describe the double-edged society of today. The paradox they suggest is that the same institutional changes that once freed man from traditional society have now turned around on him and more insidiously than before, have enslaved him while giving him the illusion of being personally free and autonomous.

It is to be noted that the contemporary writer, often called the philosopher of the new revolutionaries, Herbert Marcuse, makes a rather similar point. He argues that advanced industrial societies use subtle forms of manipulation in order to mask their basically repressive nature and thereby create the illusion of being tolerant and of allowing great individual freedom and autonomy. In his terms, such societies are one-dimensional, allowing dissent within only narrowly defined limits. The directive implied for the protestor, then, is to confront the established order in such a way so as to unmask or demystify the real mechanics of the system. This demands that one stage protests that bring out the underlying basis for the system's maintenance, namely police and military power. Thus a victory of sorts is to be had when the true power of the State or of the institution emerges in the form of MACE, clubs, tear gas, etc.

It seems to me that the historical dialectic with which we are dealing--a dialectic that forms the framework and motive force for today's revolutionary social movements--revolves around this most delicate balance point between the individual's freedom of motivation and personality enhancement and society's technetronic imperatives. The dialectic argues for a new movement away from Society, a period of renewed emphasis on Community, and finally a new synthesis which I call community-in-society. This will not be a return backwards to the older forms of community--though these forms will be tried out in the many transitional years which follow. Rather, it will be a move forward to a new level and a new type of integration between the individual's needs and society's demands. In this synthesis, the social institutions that we now know will themselves have to undergo a radical change--and here I mean all of our institutions, including the once sacred halls of academe and its faculty.

I see our nation and our world caught up today in two interdependent revolutions which feed into each other both manpower and motive force. One however follows more centrally, though not completely, from a Marxian dialectic while the other from the historical dialectic outlined in this paper. These revolutionary movements, the great tides of historical inevitability, provide the larger picture, the framework that aids our understanding of a considerable number of contemporary occurrences. These are, the Third World's revolution for social justice and what I have termed elsewhere, the Fourth World's revolution for quality. The major theme of the Third World's revolution focuses upon the clear and obvious fact that a significant segment of the population have not received their share of the abounding affluence that exists. The Fourth World's revolution--one which primarily involves the young, the white, the upper-middle classes--is a revolt against the quantity themes of rationalized-cost-accounting bureaucratic life. It is a revolution in pursuit of a new

quality for one's life.

There are both parallels and distinct differences, even conflicts, between the Third World and the Fourth World revolutionaries. Many of the same persons participate in both; if anything, however, the flow from the quality to the justice issue, as for example among the white-affluent college protestor, is much greater than the return flow. In fact, the Third Worlders wish to lay claim to the very affluence and material goodies of life which the Fourth Worlders often are actively seeking to dispense with. For the Black in the ghetto, the affluent white has made a <u>choice</u> to give up the amenities of his middle-class existence. The Blackman, however, has had no choice.

The Fourth Worlders, in actively striving to dissociate themselves from the values of the middle-class, have increasingly adopted the major cultural themes, values, and habits of the Third Worlders. In music, dance, dress and freedom of personal expression, the white affluent has sought to emulate the culture of the Black and other Third World communities. Likewise, the Fourth Worlders have emulated the Third World's protest tactics, moving from silent acceptance to nonviolent protest, to violence and Che-like tactics of guerrilla warfare.

There are many reflections today of these revolutionary movements, ranging from those we read and hear about almost daily, through the resurgence of individualism--e.g., doing one's own thing rather than one's organizational duty--as reflected in dance, art, movies, drama and all forms of expression, to the recently evolving focus on human rights over property rights in the arena of law and society. However, though there are many, I would like to point out two important reflections and briefly examine their implications for the university and for continued protest.

I. The theme of participation is one major issue that reflects the historical dialectic to which I have referred and which gains clarity when viewed against this background. There are four points I would like to make concerning individual participation in decision making. FIRSTLY, participation serves to legitimize the decisions that are made. This is in stark contrast to the consequences of today's efficient system of bureaucratic democracy in which the legitimacy of most authority is being seriously questioned. SECONDLY, participation leads to a collective sense of responsibility and involvement. Again, this is in contrast with today's still dominant pattern of collective apathy and "let-George-do-it" philosophy. THIRDLY, participation leads to a sense of community; it creates those collective representations that serve a socially integrative function. This is especially important in a society that lacks essential unifying ties and a sense of loyalty. And waving a flag or singing patriotic songs will not themselves restore what contemporary society has institutionally destroyed. FINALLY, an aspect of participation relevant particularly in the context of the university, one which is often overlooked, concerns the directly educational function that participation serves. Participation and shared control in actually running the business of the university will better prepare one to play an active role in running the affairs of society. In fact, the university that would withhold this kind of educational experience from its students is preparing them more to play a continued role of frustrated and apathetic do-nothing bystander than of responsible participant-citizen. A university and a faculty that are truly in the business of education should carefully examine the educational benefits which accrue to significant student participation in the control of all its affairs. Such control will bring with it a lesson that is virtually impossible to teach in any other manner. And it is a lesson vital to the inner workings of a true democracy. The institution

should be a training ground for a new and better society and not a continuing school for frustration and withdrawal. It is in this area, by the way, that the queasy alliance between students and faculty will break.

II. A second major reflection of this new historical dialectic that I would like to mention, concerns the revolt against superrationalism and the excessive rationalization of all life. The process of rationalization, "so long as it fed upon the structure of traditional society, was a generally creative and liberating process; but today, it threatens to become mechanizing, regimenting and ultimately, reason-destroying." Much of the so-called anti-intellectual quality of today's protest movements is basically not anti-intellectual as such but is rather a response to the sterile, superrational quality that technetronic society has brought with it. Several contemporary movements, not commonly thought of as protest or revolutionary, share this same anti-rationalistic quality. The activities which characterize the rampaging tide of sensitivity-training and encounter-group programs, for example-most of which appropriately enough cater to the white, affluent middle-classes, one might say to the over-organized, bureaucratic uptights of this modern society-emphasize instinctual or emotional release. Concerted efforts are made to divest one of his societal, organizational roles and identities and get down to the human nitty-gritty.

This anti-rationalistic trend is reflected in important ways in the university as well. There is a concerted effort to restore morality and values into the increasingly amoral academic community. The secularization and rationalization of life that characterizes the 20th century of man has produced a group of seekers in search of those new institutions in which values and principles of morality are both expressed and more importantly, are lived in fact. As Stark and Glock's study of religion in America suggest, those seeking such values are turned away at the church's door. They turn elsewhere.

The university, where one might hope to find enduring values, even those of scholarship and the pursuit of truth, fails miserably. The university has become the leader of the superrationalized trend. With near total dispassion and without even a confession to being value-laden, the academician tries to lead his students to follow in his style. However, the student sees in him a man of reason, but nothing of value; a man of the head, but without soul. He sees in some a detachment from the web of societal life. The academician turns out to be the essence of societal rather than communal man: he is seen to be more in pursuit of the buck, of status, stardom and fame than of anything so apparently mundane as truth and wisdom. It has not been in the halls of academe that the student seeker has found this illusive moral man. He does, however, find values and morality in the institution; but rather than there being a remedy to the rationalized sterility around him, they exist in the same form as on the outside. Values and moral choices enter the academicians' and the institutions' world, but these turn out to be the same values of personal achievement and self-aggrandizement that abound in everyman. As Clark Kerr said: "the campus serves as a good introduction to society."

Another form which this pursuit of the nonrationalized humane and moral takes occurs in the radical new and free university movements. The rigid departmentalization which specialization has brought with it operates against the study of the significant and the relevant. Each expert is so narrowly focused that complex problems are put aside and remain unstudied: for after all, he argues, they are too complex to fall into my discipline's range.

The radical and free university movement is a protest against the irrelevance of the contemporary institution whose very structure works against relevant education. I view these movements not as throwbacks to some earlier and now historically irrelevant form of the university, but rather as being

definitely in the direction of the historical dialectic I've outlined and as an essential corrective to an otherwise disastrous state of affairs.

Lest it appear as though the institution and its faculty were completely to blame, a considerable amount of the irrelevance of today's academic work, especially in the social sciences, lies within the discipline's mainstream Establishment itself. With the social crises of today's world abounding, more students than ever are coming to major in the social sciences, hoping there to find some answers, possibly even to be of some help. Without a doubt, however, too much of today's social science is neither social nor science. For that matter, the term irrelevance can be used to describe its unrelatedness <u>both</u> to the urgencies of today's world and to any form of real understanding of human behavior. It is not simply that too much work in the social sciences is of the ivory-tower sort; it is rather that too much does not even warrant our building a tower.

* * * *

At first it is paradoxical but on examination quite understandable that the university should both lead the way in the move towards rationalistic and bureaucratic society and <u>at the same time</u> take an important role in its downfall by inadvertantly highlighting the essential paradoxes of the contemporary state of society. That is, provided that the university and its faculty <u>lead</u> in moving towards the new synthesis, rather than, as has been their wont, dutifully to follow. Although it is argued, sometimes even maintained as a fact, that the university is society's critic, the actual facts of the situation would lead even the most naive observer to add the name of the university to that infamous duo, giving us the <u>military-industrial-educational</u> complex as a description of the contemporary and influential Establishment against change. The financial tie-in between the university its faculty and the Federal

Government on the one hand and between university investments and American industry on the other, produce a situation in which the critic's role is at best watered down.

A university that would lead us into the new community-in-society will have to change its own complexion rather radically. Today we are in a crisis. The response and responsibility of the university and its faculty can no longer be to continue to support, relatively uncontested, the social institutions that are responsible for that crisis. Leadership in reshaping the state of the nation and the world in accord with the Third and Fourth World Revolutions should become a major responsibility of the university. If it is to preserve its role as a significant and free institution it must become the enactment of the ideals of man rather than handmaiden to the technetronic society.

It is not an easy task to describe what such a university would look like or to indicate all the changes that will have to be made. In the few paragraphs remaining, however, let me briefly mention several directions for change and then conclude.

1. This new university would not be in the business of training technicians to service the complex machinery of technetronic society. I would expect industry to begin their own college programs and train the kind of technicians they demand. This will leave the university free again to return to its major business of education.

2. The present university will have to change its own shape, becoming <u>less</u> a perfect example of all that is wrong with rationalized bureaucracy and <u>more</u> a model for the newer community-in-society. It need not become smaller, for there are advantages to largeness and the diversity it permits. But it will become decentralized, less highly specialized by department and discipline, more actively run by students and by faculty. It will offer the student a

greater variety of individually tailored programs rather than a mass-packaged prefrozen curriculum. Students will pick and choose with greater freedom. Their diet will not always be as faculty might choose, but in a four-year period, most will have sampled more intelligently and in terms of their own needs and individually evolving awarenesses than is provided by present standards of force-feeding and rigid programming. Students will be involved in more programs of active field work and independent study. This will demand that faculty especially beccme aware of the knowledges that are to be obtained in living work as well as in reading about it.

3. Faculty as presently constituted will have about as much difficulty in thinking about their own position in this new university as physicians have had in dealing with their role under Medicare. Faculty, in fact, provide one of the major, as yet untapped reservoirs of resistance to change. Many will feel that their autonomy has been lost; no longer will they be protected by administrators who function primarily to keep things running smoothly enough for Professor Fat-Cat to make it more quickly to the top. Others will be upset with the extra time demanded of them to enter increasingly into the running of their university. It is just possible that in this future about which I am thinking, persons will enter teaching in the university with more compassion and concern for education and for the pursuit of knowledge and truth than for money, fame, power, etc. Those "makers" on their way up should indeed have a locale in which they can conduct their business. I am not convinced, however, that their business lies in the university. Research and good teaching do usually go hand-in-hand, not necessarily frequent publication and good teaching. It is about time that we admit that not everyone should teach. Nor for that matter, not everyone should be pressured by the star-system to turn out reams of publications, usually nonsensical and trivial. It may be true that a million

monkeys in front of a million typewriters could type out the works of a Shakespeare, but I see no reason why the university should insist on putting such a thesis to the test.

To conclude: In essence, there are two kinds of historical inevitability. The one, pointed out by persons such as Kerr and Brzezinski, will bring us into the technologically advanced, technetronic age. The other, the human revolutions, are embodied within the themes of the Third and Fourth World's movements. They will bring us into an age of social justice and "new community." If these latter movements, for any reason fail, either we will not be around to witness the great advances that await us, or worse yet, we will be around, but our lives will not really be worth the plastic they are written on.

These are the surging tides of historical inevitability. But where will the university and where will its faculty be? Back in Washington, perhaps, helping to shore up the battlements? Digging drainage ditches or manning hastily prepared patchworks on the campus, hoping to let enough of the flooding tide drain off to keep the tottering ship afloat just a few more years? Perhaps lost somewhere up in the clouds, dreaming of those halcyon days gone by or of some kind of future that will never really be? But maybe, just maybe, the university and its community of faculty, and students and staff will use their potential power as a vital and significant change agent to guide us and perhaps even to lead us on that long journey.